United Nations A/C.3/55/SR.46

General Assembly
Fifty-fifth session

Official Records

Distr.: General
30 April 2001
English
Original: Spanish

Third Committee

Summary record of the 46th meeting
Held at Headquarters, New York, on Friday, 3 November 2000, at 3 p.m.

Chairperson: Ms. Gittens-Joseph ..... (Trinidad and Tobago)

Contents

Agenda item 107: Advancement of women (*continued*)

This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate corrigendum for each Committee.

00-72748 (E)

The meeting was called to order at 3.45 p.m.

Agenda item 107: Advancement of women
(*continued*)

Adoption of measures on draft resolution A/C.3/55/L.11/Rev.1

1. **The Chairperson** said that the draft resolution had no programme budget implications.

2. **Mr. Peters** (Netherlands) announced that Azerbaijan, Cyprus, Ghana, Lesotho, Liberia, Malawi, Malta, Namibia, Paraguay, Republic of Moldova and Thailand had become sponsors of the draft resolution. Also, in the third line of the first preambular paragraph of document A/C.3/55/L.11/Rev.1, the word "later" should be deleted.

3. With regard to the consultations held the previous day, one delegation had sufficient concerns about the text to request that it should be put to a vote. That delegation had distributed a one-page position paper explaining its concerns. The sponsors had then drafted a counter-proposal, which was rejected by the delegation. That morning, to everyone's surprise, instead of one general document and one document expressing concerns about the sponsors' text, there were two sets of amendments, one prepared by Jordan and another by Pakistan. Owing to the extra time granted by the Chairperson, the sponsors had been able to meet to try and achieve consensus, and they had prepared the following amendments, which took into consideration the concerns of Jordan and Pakistan. First, in the third preambular paragraph, the phrase ", a common feature of which is premeditation,", should be inserted before the words "are a human rights issue", and the phrase "and that the failure to do so constitutes a human rights violation" should be deleted. Second, to address Pakistan's concern, the fifth preambular paragraph should be deleted. Third, also with regard to Pakistan's comments on the eighth preambular paragraph, the expression "fundamental changes in society are required, and underlining" should be replaced by the phrase "awareness-raising campaigns through print and electronic media, as well as educational programmes, are required to underline". Fourth, in paragraph 1, the words "including those that are identified in paragraph 96 (a)" should be replaced by the phrase "including the crimes identified in paragraph 96 (a)", and, in response to Jordan's concerns, after the words "against women committed in the name of honour" the phrase ", a common feature of which is premeditation and" should be added. Fifth, responding to a question posed by Pakistan, in paragraph 7, after the words "in question", the expression "and on the issue of crimes of passion" should be inserted.

4. To recapitulate, the foregoing were a series of revisions formulated by the group of sponsors to reflect the concerns about the text voiced by some delegations, even after its first revision. As some would recall, the Netherlands delegation had faxed the revised version to all the delegations on 22 September, and even one day earlier to the Pakistani delegation. Thus, the text submitted for consideration differed from the one originally contemplated and from the results of the six public hearings, the various consultations among the sponsors and the innumerable bilateral meetings held on the issue. The first version of the text had already incorporated significant changes to accommodate the concerns of various delegations, including those that still had doubts. The Netherlands hoped that the current series of amendments would facilitate the adoption by consensus of document A/C.3/55/L.11/Rev.1.

5. **Prince** Zeid Ra'ad Zeid-**Al-Hussein** (Jordan) introduced a number of amendments to the draft resolution (A/C.3/55/L.11/Rev.1). In the first line of the third preambular paragraph, the word "premeditated" should be inserted before the words "crimes against women". Similarly, in paragraph 1, line 6, the word "premeditated" should be inserted before the words "crimes against women". The purpose of that amendment was to clarify the definition of that crime, since it had common features with crimes of passion. If that were not done, a crime of passion might be interpreted as a crime against women committed in the name of honour and any government could be accused of not having exercised due diligence to prevent the commission of such a crime. If the element of premeditation were recognized, it might constitute a powerful legal deterrent and might, among other things, also make awareness-raising campaigns and educational programmes more effective. Lastly, in the second line of paragraph 1, the words "those that are identified in paragraph 96 (a)" should be replaced by the words "those that are identified as crimes in paragraph 96 (a)". The current wording was too vague.

6. **Ms. Afifi** (Morocco) expressed support for the amendments proposed by the representative of Jordan.

7. **Mr. Peters** (Netherlands), noting that the amendments in question had been discussed at the morning meeting, said that it had been his understanding that, with the set of revisions he had introduced, the issue had been resolved. He gathered, then, that the Jordanian delegation did not accept those revisions. The sponsors did not agree with the first two amendments, since the outcome document of the twenty-third special session of the General Assembly, entitled "Women 2000: gender equality, development and peace for the twenty-first century", which was the first universally accepted instrument where crimes of honour had been mentioned, had not specified in any way that type of crimes and such qualifications should not now be introduced. Although he understood the distinction that Jordan was making, he did not consider it decisive. He recognized that preventive measures could be more effective in the case of premeditated crime but that unpremeditated crime was sometimes the result of societal pressures and attitudes, which could be changed through State policies. The prevention to which the draft resolution referred consisted not of adopting police measures but of applying policies that prevented such crimes in a broader sense, including those committed without premeditation, because education and legal measures could bring about a change in mentalities. Paragraph 4 of the previous version had referred to extenuating circumstances; that was what had sparked the debate on the issue of premeditation. That paragraph had been deleted to avoid controversy. The sponsors did not accept any of the amendments proposed by the representative of Jordan and would vote against them if the matter was put to the vote.

8. **Mr. Bhatti** (Pakistan) expressed support for the amendments proposed by the representative of Jordan. Premeditation was what made the difference between crimes of passion and crimes of honour.

9. **Mr. Sangaré** (Mali), speaking on a point of order while endorsing the Pakistani delegation's position, said that the Committee was not holding informal consultations but was supposed to be adopting a decision on a draft resolution and was not making headway in that regard. Once the sponsors had agreed on a text, even if some delegations did not agree with it, the Chairman should assume the responsibility of putting the text to a vote.

10. **Mr. Hynes** (Canada), speaking on behalf of Australia, New Zealand, Norway and the Republic of Korea, expressed strong support for the draft resolution under consideration. The enormous attention it had received demonstrated that violence against women, including crimes of passion, was a cause of serious universal concern. It was therefore important that the draft resolution should be adopted without a vote, maintaining the traditional international consensus on questions relating to the advancement of women. It was equally important for all Member States to honour the strong commitments they had made at the special session of the General Assembly in June 2000. It was regrettable that the Jordanian delegation had submitted amendments at the current phase of the Committee's deliberations. The sponsors had submitted a number of revisions to Member States for their consideration and would appreciate some reactions in that regard from the Jordanian delegation or any other interested delegations before considering putting the matter to a vote. He sincerely appealed to the representative of Jordan to consider withdrawing his amendments, otherwise it would set a very bad precedent in terms of how the Committee dealt with questions relating to the advancement of women and human rights.

11. **Mr. Welsh** (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland), referring to the expression "due diligence", said that it had been agreed at the twenty-third special session of the General Assembly. It did not mean that all and every single one of the crimes must be prevented; rather, governments must do everything that was reasonably within their power to prevent violent crimes against women. They must ensure, for example, that there was legislation in that regard, that such legislation was implemented and that the police worked effectively and that even information campaigns were carried out. As to premeditation, the perpetrators of the crimes concerned justified their acts by invoking honour, whether they were premeditated or not. Since the outcome document of the special session did not distinguish between premeditated crimes and other crimes, adding that term to the text would exclude a number of crimes that had not been excluded in that document. Acceptance of the Jordanian delegation's amendment would mean departing from what had been agreed then, and that was not acceptable. His delegation would therefore vote against that amendment.

12. **Mr. Peters** (Netherlands), speaking on behalf of the sponsors, reiterated that none of the three amendments submitted by the representative of Jordan

was acceptable and requested a vote on the amendments.

13. **Prince** Zeid Ra'ad Zeid-**Al-Hussein** (Jordan) said that deliberations had been going on for a number of weeks and that the question had not been raised at the last minute, nor had it been brought up to complicate the situation. Concerning the United Kingdom delegation's remarks with respect to due diligence, he said that precision was needed so that governments could not be accused of failing to exercise sufficient due diligence in the case of such crimes. That was what needed to be prevented and that was why his delegation would maintain the amendments it had submitted earlier on.

14. **Mr. Sabharwal** (India), speaking in explanation of vote before the vote on the amendments to draft resolution A/C.3/55/L.11/Rev.1, which had been the subject of lengthy negotiations, said that there had been optimism that consensus would be achieved; it had not been possible, however, for his delegation to examine in depth the most recent amendments and revisions, nor to obtain instructions in that regard. His delegation would therefore abstain from voting on those amendments.

15. **Mr. Alaie** (Islamic Republic of Iran), speaking in explanation of vote before the vote, said that his delegation wholeheartedly supported Jordan's proposal that the word "premeditated" should be inserted before the words "crimes against women committed in the name of honour", and his delegation would vote in favour of those amendments.

16. *A vote was taken on the amendments submitted by Jordan.*

17. *The amendments were rejected by 80 votes to 22, with 24 abstentions.*

18. **Mr. Oda** (Egypt) said that he supported and continued to support Jordan's proposed amendments to the draft resolution because premeditation must be taken into account in order to clearly differentiate between a crime committed in the name of honour and a crime of passion. The result of the vote proved that the issue warranted further consideration by the United Nations.

19. **Mr. Reyes-Rodríguez** (Cuba) said that his delegation had abstained during the vote on the amendments because, regrettably, although there had been consensus during the five-year review of the Beijing Platform for Action, some States which had joined in that consensus had subsequently seen fit to break with it.

20. **Mr. Bhatti** (Pakistan) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the amendments proposed by Jordan because, although it unequivocally condemned crimes committed in the name of honour or of passion or of any other description, the draft resolution before the Committee misrepresented the consensus achieved at the five-year review conference.

21. **The Chairperson** said that the Committee would take a vote on draft resolution A/C.3/55/L.11/Rev.1 as a whole.

22. **Mr. Peters** (Netherlands) said he would try to clarify the situation, since delegations might be confused by the many proposals which had been made. Other than the proposals put forward by the sponsors to meet the concerns of those who had doubts with regard to the text of the draft resolution, there had been only one revision to the text, that being to delete the word "later" in the third line of the first preambular paragraph. Delegations had expressed their concerns with respect to various issues, and those would be reflected in the summary records of the session. The sponsors hoped that, in keeping with the traditional consensus on the issue, delegations which had doubts with regard to the text would still be able to join in the consensus.

23. **Prince** Zeid Ra'ad Zeid-**Al-Hussein** (Jordan), speaking in explanation of vote before the vote, said that crimes of all kinds committed against women should be condemned without reservation by all delegations. The crime referred to in draft resolution A/C.3/55/L.11/Rev.1 was not condoned by any religion, culture or tribal custom. A crime committed against a woman as a means of cleansing one's family honour stemmed from a frame of mind shaped by a twisted understanding of existing social mores or religious obligations. It would be closer to the truth to speak of a "crime of ignorance" or "crimes committed against women as a consequence of ignorance". In Jordan, although such crimes were rare occurrences, the Government had committed itself to eliminating them and to removing from the Penal Code the "absolving excuse" for the perpetrators of such acts.

24. He could not refrain from commenting on the unfortunate way in which the draft resolution had been submitted to the General Assembly. The original draft

had been distributed to delegations immediately following a screening in the Dag Hammarsjköld auditorium of a documentary on that subject, which had begun with an Islamic call to prayer. In a few seconds, the producers of the film and the organizers of the screening had, knowingly or unknowingly, associated Islam with that crime, without any justification. If those responsible for the draft resolution had proceeded differently and worked methodically during the year with all States, at meetings with experts and colleagues, in an effort to reach mutual agreement on the matter, as well as on the other crimes listed in paragraph 96 (a) of the outcome document of the twenty-third special session of the General Assembly, in order to produce a consensus draft resolution in due course, the result would have been different. No effort had been spared to cooperate with the sponsors in arriving at an agreed text; after six weeks, however, in spite of the positive suggestions made by friends and colleagues, that had not been possible. From the outset, his delegation had considered it crucial that the word "premeditated" be inserted before the words "crimes against women committed in the name of honour" in the third preambular paragraph and in paragraph 1. Not including the word "premeditated" in those paragraphs would mean that "crimes against women committed in the name of honour" would also include crimes committed out of anger in reaction to a particular circumstance; in other words, the draft would implicitly include not only the crimes mentioned in the resolution but also crimes of passion. If that were the case, it should be stated clearly; if not, the insertion of the word "premeditated" should not pose any difficulties and indeed would clarify the issue. The third preambular paragraph stated that "States have an obligation to exercise due diligence to prevent, investigate and punish the perpetrators of such crimes". He wondered, however, how States could exercise due diligence to prevent crimes committed in a sudden fit of rage. States in which such crimes occurred could find themselves accused of human rights violations for not having exercised "enough" due diligence to prevent such acts. Accordingly, his delegation could not support the draft resolution in its current form.

25. **Ms. Monroy** (Mexico) said she would vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.3/55/L.11/Rev.1, since it reflected one of the agreements reached at the twenty-third special session of the General Assembly, which reviewed the Beijing Platform for Action. She would have preferred, however, that the draft enjoyed the support of all members of the Committee in order to reflect the priority which the international community had accorded the issue.

26. **Mr. Oda** (Egypt), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting, reiterated his Government's firm commitment to the elimination of all forms of violence against women and, in that context, noted that his delegation had been one of the main sponsors of draft resolution A/C.3/55/L.13, on the elimination of all forms of violence and crimes against women. Draft resolution A/C.3/55/L.11/Rev.1 dealt with crimes committed in the name of honour, but it did not clearly define such crimes or make any distinction between premeditated crimes and crimes of passion. Although he agreed that crimes committed in the name of honour must be eliminated, it was his earnest conviction that all forms of violence against women must be given equal attention, and he could not support a draft resolution which was selective and limited in scope. He would therefore abstain.

27. **Ms. Setyawati** (Indonesia), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting, said that there was no link between the murder of women and girl children including crimes committed in the name of passion, honour or race and the characteristics of specific societies or communities or the teachings, customs and values of Islam. She deeply regretted the way in which the resolution had been introduced, with the screening of a documentary which, apparently intentionally, associated honour crimes with Islamic customs and verses from the Koran. That showed unacceptable prejudice against a religion as well as ignorance of the facts, and such material had no place in the United Nations. It was to be hoped that in the future such occurrences would be avoided and resolutions could be reviewed on their merits. Her delegation nevertheless fully agreed with the substance of the draft resolution and would vote in favour of it, especially given that it was in keeping with Indonesia's "zero tolerance" policy with respect to all forms of violence against women.

28. **Ms. de Armas García** (Cuba) said she condemned all forms of crime against women, including the terrible crimes committed in the name of honour, and wholeheartedly supported all actions to ensure the elimination of violence of all kinds against women. She nevertheless regretted that the consensus which had been achieved on such an important issue

had been broken, and she expressed reservations at the manner in which the draft resolution had been prepared.

29. **Mr. Alaidroos** (Yemen), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting, welcomed and supported the comments and amendments relating to the draft resolution, in particular those put forward by Jordan. He would have preferred that the sponsors had accepted those amendments, which would have resulted in broader support for the draft resolution and possibly consensus. He would nevertheless vote in favour of the draft resolution based on the conviction that the resolution's objective was to put an end to one form of violence against women.

30. **Mr. Alaie** (Islamic Republic of Iran), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting, said that violence against women was a terrible phenomenon which must be countered with decisive actions. The fact that women were killed in the name of honour was a result of degrading tribal attitudes expressed in abhorrent traditional practices which bore no relation to the cultures and religions of any country. Iran, reflecting its Islamic principles and religious values, condemned all forms of crimes, including those committed in the name of honour, and was morally and legally prepared to firmly oppose such occurrences. Accordingly, he stressed that the United Nations must consider all forms of crimes to be equally serious and accord them equal treatment. The draft resolution failed to meet fundamental and commonly accepted requirements such as respect for the principles of objectivity and non-selectivity in the mechanisms proposed and the issues considered. His delegation would abstain because it would have preferred the sponsors of the draft resolution to have expanded its scope to include all forms and manifestations of crimes against women.

31. **Ms. Ibrahimova** (Azerbaijan) said she would support the draft resolution and was in favour of adopting effective measures to prevent all kinds of violence against women. Her Government was doing everything possible to eliminate and eradicate crimes against women but believed that it was an error to associate any religion with such crimes.

32. **Mr. Bhatti** (Pakistan), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting, said that no type of crime, whether committed for reasons of honour, passion or race, had any legal or religious justification, and that those responsible for such crimes must be treated as murderers. His Government remained committed to eliminating all forms of violence against women, as shown by the fact that his delegation was one of the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.3/55/L.13, which referred to all crimes against women. In 2000 the Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action had been reviewed, with excellent results, and it was regrettable and disturbing that the consensus reached after months of negotiations was being broken. It was also regrettable that United Nations facilities had been used to screen a documentary on violence against women which criticized the Islamic countries and the juridical regime in Islamic societies. That screening had aimed at selectively criticizing a particular religion, culture and region, and the Islamic Group had expressed profound concern at such an abuse of United Nations facilities. Violence against women must be combated at all levels of society; his Government had therefore organized awareness campaigns on the economic, social and psychological consequences of that phenomenon. His delegation also intended to propose amendments to the draft resolution so that it would reflect the language of the outcome document of the twenty-third special session of the General Assembly. Unfortunately, however, some statements on transparency and the need to take into account all opinions had been less than truthful, and the process as a whole had been motivated not by the desire to put an end to violence against women but to selectively criticize certain cultures. As a result, his delegation would abstain in the voting as a way of showing that while it rejected selective interpretation and manoeuvring, it nevertheless remained committed to combating and eliminating all forms of violence against women.

33. **The Chairperson** said that the delegation of Azerbaijan should not have explained its vote, as it was one of the sponsors of the draft resolution.

34. **Ms. Al-Hajaji** (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) said that she would abstain in the voting because the draft resolution was selective and attempted to set a dangerous precedent on how human rights were dealt with. The Koran was the basis for the law in Libyan society, and its criminal code made no distinction among crimes. All crimes against women were abominable and should be condemned by the international community. During the informal consultations, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya had tried to

introduce revisions and make constructive proposals in order to achieve consensus, but they had been rejected by the sponsors. Circumstances preceding and accompanying the negotiations suggested that the resolution intended to give a negative impression of a specific culture; hence the refusal to add other types of crimes against women.

35. **Mr. Al Saidi** (Kuwait) said that Kuwait was committed to eliminating all forms of violence including crimes against women, which was why it supported and became a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.3/55/L.13/Rev.1, which referred to all forms of discrimination and crimes against women. The draft resolution was selective, however; it presented a unilateral point of view and dealt with just one type of problem. Kuwait would abstain in the voting, in view of the circumstances that had surrounded the process from the outset; also it had hoped that the draft resolution would be broader in scope and that the sponsors would accept the amendments submitted by Jordan.

36. **Mr. Sabharwal** (India), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting, said that he would vote in favour of the resolution because India was opposed to all forms of crime and violence against women.

37. *A vote was taken on the draft resolution, as orally revised.*

38. *Draft resolution A/C.3/55/L.13/Rev.1, as orally revised, was adopted by 120 votes to none, with 25 abstentions.*

39. **Ms. Yu** Wenzhe (China) said that China had always worked actively to defend the equality and legitimate interests of women and was opposed to all forms of violence including crimes against women. However, it considered that the resolution was selective with regard to the nature of the crimes, and she had therefore abstained in the voting.

40. **Mr. Mowla** (Bangladesh) said that he agreed with the amendments submitted by Jordan because they would have helped achieve consensus in the adoption of the draft resolution. Bangladesh had always maintained a firm position on the elimination of all forms of violence against women, as shown by its adoption of the Optional Protocol and its enactment of stronger domestic laws to punish the perpetrators of crimes against women. He regretted, however, that the negotiations had not been clear and that the Committee's usual spirit of collaboration had not prevailed. It was very unfortunate that it had been necessary to submit the draft resolution to a vote and that consensus had not been achieved.

41. **The Chairperson** recalled that, under rule 128 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, the proposer of a proposal or of an amendment was not permitted to explain his vote on his own proposal or amendment.

42. **Ms. Al Moosa** (Oman) said that she had abstained in the voting because the draft resolution was selective in the way it dealt with violence against women and did not reflect the consensus achieved in the final document of the twenty-third special session of the General Assembly. Her Government was fully committed to the elimination of all forms of violence against women and had therefore become a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.3/55/L.13/Rev.1.

43. **Ms. Gimariam** (Ethiopia) said that she would have voted in favour of the draft resolution if she had been present during the voting.

44. **Mr. García González** (El Salvador) reiterated his Government's political will to eliminate all forms of violence including crimes against women and its support for such efforts. However, he regretted that the Committee had failed to achieve the traditional consensus in adopting resolutions concerning women. He had therefore abstained in the voting and reserved the right to return to the position that his delegation had taken on the matter at the twenty-third special session of the General Assembly.

45. **Ms. Kapalata** (United Republic of Tanzania), deeply regretting the direction taken by the discussion on such an important issue as violence against women, said she hoped that the spirit of Beijing and the special session of the General Assembly would prevail.

46. **Ms. Carné de Trécesson** (France), speaking on behalf of the European Union, said that she decidedly supported the draft resolution submitted by one of its member countries. She regretted that consensus had not been reached, following a prolonged negotiation process with the interested delegations. As a sponsor, and motivated by a spirit of consensus, France had decided to support the text despite significant modifications to the original version. Evidently, the foregoing did not call into question what had been accomplished so far or the commitments assumed

during the special session of the General Assembly to fight against all forms of violence against women, such as crimes committed in the name of honour. She hoped that States would fulfil the commitments they had made and continue the work being carried out within the United Nations with the customary spirit of consensus.

Adoption of measures on draft resolution A/C.3/55/L.13/Rev.1

47. **The Chairperson** said that the draft resolution had no programme budget implications and announced that Cape Verde, Kyrgyzstan, Oman, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkmenistan and Yemen had become sponsors when the revised draft resolution was submitted.

48. **Ms. Mesdoua** (Algeria) announced that Brunei Darussalam, Maldives, Thailand and Uzbekistan had become sponsors of the draft resolution, to which she wished to make a number of oral revisions. First, the title should be changed to "Elimination of all forms of violence against women, including crimes identified in the outcome document of the twenty-third special session of the General Assembly entitled 'Women 2000: gender equality, development and peace for the twenty-first century'". Likewise, in the first line of paragraph 2, the second line of paragraph 4, the fourth line of paragraph 6, the fourth line of paragraph 8, the third line of paragraph 9 and the third line of paragraph 10, following the words "crimes against women", the phrase ", including crimes identified in the outcome document of the twenty-third special session of the General Assembly" should be inserted. In paragraph 4, the words "prevention and elimination" should be followed by the phrase "of all forms of violence and crimes against women". Finally, in paragraph 5, the words "whether occurring in public or private life," should be inserted before the phrase "by encouraging and supporting public campaigns".

49. *Draft resolution A/C.3/55/L.13/Rev.1, as orally revised, was adopted without a vote.*

50. **Ms. Maillé** (Canada), speaking on behalf of Australia, Iceland, Liechtenstein, New Zealand, Norway and the Republic of Korea, strongly supported the substance of the resolution but stressed that the elimination of all forms of violence against women required an integrated, holistic and multidisciplinary approach which addressed the need for social and economic reforms together with legal reforms. It would have been preferable to give greater attention to the social and economic dimension in a resolution to be adopted by the General Assembly on that subject, as was the case in other forums where the topic was being discussed. She hoped that further consideration of the topic in the Third Committee would incorporate the full range of commitments made by Member States towards eliminating violence against women.

51. **Ms. Carné de Trécesson** (France), speaking on behalf of the European Union, said it was essential for the General Assembly to adopt a resolution based on the outcome of the twenty-third special session of the General Assembly, given the importance of the issue of the elimination of all forms of violence against women. She welcomed the delegations' renewed expression of their intention to follow up the relevant discussions and implement the decisions taken five months earlier.

52. **Ms. Nicodemos** (Brazil) said that the Brazilian Constitution enshrined the principle of the State's responsibility for the prevention and elimination of all forms of violence against women; she therefore welcomed the opportunity to join the consensus on draft resolution A/C.3/55/L.13/Rev.1. She would nevertheless have preferred to avoid the distinction between violence and crime introduced in the draft, which did not appear in relevant United Nations documents, such as the Declaration on the Elimination of Violence against Women, the Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action and the outcome document of the twenty-third special session of the General Assembly.

53. **Ms. Kim** (Republic of Korea) expressed support for the statement made by the representative of Canada but said that, although her delegation had joined the consensus, it had some concerns. Given the wide-ranging nature of the draft resolution, it should deal with all forms of violence against women in a comprehensive and balanced manner; it should give equal importance to the victims of acts of violence committed in situations of peace and the victims of acts committed during armed conflicts. In paragraph 15 of the outcome document of the twenty-third special session of the General Assembly, all States had recognized the significance of the adoption of the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court, which provided that rape, sexual slavery, enforced prostitution, forced pregnancy, enforced sterilization and other forms of sexual violence were war crimes

when committed in the context of armed conflict and also, under defined circumstances, crimes against humanity. She could not therefore understand why the adoption of the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court had not been welcomed at the fifty-fifth session of the General Assembly. She called on all Member States to join her in expressing that concern. She also recalled that although large numbers of women were currently the victims of various acts of violence in armed conflicts, the draft resolution did not give sufficient attention to those victims.

54. **Ms. Leyton** (Chile) said she regretted the way in which the content of the draft resolution had been treated; its scope was much more limited than that of resolutions on the same issue adopted by the Commission on Human Rights. It was also unfortunate that the draft resolution went no further than the Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action and that it contained elements which weakened efforts for the promotion and protection of women's human rights.

55. **Mr. Naber** (Jordan) said he looked forward to receiving the report of the Secretary-General on all the issues contained in the draft resolution.

The meeting rose at 6.15 p.m.